

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of October 15, 2004.

By this Amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 1-2 directed to non-elected species. Replacement sheet of drawings are attached to insert drawing numerals consistent with the specification, and which apparently were not previously included in Figure 3. Claim 3 has been amended to overcome the claim rejection of section 3 of the Office Action, and claims 4 through 7 have been added.

Regarding section 3, the claim has been amended to provide consistent antecedence with regard to the "code" recitation and thus thought to overcome the rejection.

In sections 4-5, original claim 3 was rejected as being unpatentable over Yeung in view of Applicant's disclosure. Reconsideration is requested. Applicant agrees with Examiner's characterization of the reference as set forth in the second paragraph of section 5, particularly that Yeung is "silent as to the specifics of the barcode identifying the weight of the mail piece, mailing fees for the mail piece, and spatial location of the mail piece within the bulk shipment". Yeung is simply a bar code as shown in Figure 2 placed at the addressee portion of the mailing item that provides an alternative to the need to affix conventional physical postage (column 1, lines 11-16). The code provides customer identification 2a, point of delivery information 2b, piece identification and originator 2c, and a password security code 2d. Thus only item specific information is provided for the shipment, but not specifics of the shipment in masse or specifics of an individual item within such shipment. This does not yield the extensive described benefits of the present invention, which allows the receiver to know in advance the work being delivered for proper planning, and the sender to know the status in processing the aggregate or individual items.

Against this recognition of the limitations of Yeung, Examiner opined that Applicant's specification said that it commonly well-known to provide such information on the bar code. Reconsideration of such position is respectfully requested. As outlined on page 2, limited information is currently supplied to the postal facility, and only upon delivery thereto. Further information at the facility is available only through manual determination. This limits the feedback information as set forth on page 3, i.e. missing items in a presumed sequence cannot be determined, duplicate or missing items cannot be identified, and no verification of individual items can be provided. This clearly discloses that in fact such information is not provided by bar code or otherwise. Examiner has not identified the portion of the specification for this supposition. The only description in the specification that may perhaps have formed the basis is the first paragraph on page 9 wherein it is disclosed that the code is printed in accordance with the bar code format used for sorting and delivery. Such disclosure merely denotes the commonality of the bar code format for physical appearance for scanning, which are well known to be only address specific. It is thus Applicant's position that the specification is clearly contrary to an interpretation that the claimed bar code specifics were well know, and that claim 3 as amended is patentable over the cited art. Should Examiner have other portions of the specification that are being interpreted to the contrary, Applicant will consider same after specific identification thereof.

Claim 4 has been added reciting the location of the code at the addressor location on the mailing item. Yeung specifically places the bar code at the addressee location, and does not teach or suggest an alternative. Claims 5 and 6 has been added reciting additional information subsets on the code including date and mailing agent task activity. Claim 7 is an additional independent claim based

on the subject matter of claims 3 through 6. It is submitted that the dependent and new claims are allowable over the cited reference.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 3 through 7 recite patentable novelty over the noted reference and allowance of the same is respectfully requested.

Dated: January 12, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

MILLS LAW FIRM, PLLC



Peter D. Sachtjen, Reg. No. 24,619

Mills Law Firm, PLLC
Post Office Box 1245
Cary, NC 27512-1245
(919) 462-3036
Attorney Direct Line: (252) 413-0475